

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

USDC SDNY  
DOCUMENT  
ELECTRONICALLY FILED  
DOC #:  
DATE FILED: **MAY 12 2014**

-----X  
:  
:  
:  
IN RE ALUMINUM WAREHOUSING  
ANTITRUST LITIGATION  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
-----X

13 MD 2481 (KBF)  
and all related cases

CASE MANAGEMENT  
ORDER NO. 4

KATHERINE B. FORREST, District Judge:

Following the status conference in this multidistrict litigation on April 25, 2014, the Court directed the Clerk of Court to open three new civil actions that are part of this multidistrict litigation. (ECF Nos. 347, 356, 359.) These three actions correspond to the three previously filed consolidated amended complaints in this multidistrict litigation, and contain the parties listed in each of the individual actions included in these complaints prior to consolidation.

The three new actions are:

- In re Aluminum Warehousing Antitrust Litigation (Direct Purchaser Plaintiffs) (14 Civ. 3116);
- In re Aluminum Warehousing Antitrust Litigation (Commercial End User Plaintiffs) (14 Civ. 3121); and
- In re Aluminum Warehousing Antitrust Litigation (Consumer End User Plaintiffs) (14 Civ. 3122).

The Court has also now closed all individual actions in this multidistrict litigation with the exception of AGFA Corp. v. The Goldman Sachs Group, Inc. et al.

(14 Civ. 211) and Mag Instrument Inc. v. The Goldman Sachs Group Inc. et al. (14 Civ. 217); plaintiffs in these actions informed the Court of their intention to stay separate from the consolidated complaints by amending their previously-filed complaints to allege individual, non-class action claims. (ECF No. 167.)

Going forward, all parties shall comply with the requirement stated in Case Management Order No. 1 (ECF No. 153) and on the record during the April 25, 2014 conference (see 4/25/14 Tr. at 8-9, ECF No. 362) that all papers filed in this multidistrict litigation shall be filed on both the master docket and any of the three new actions to which it pertains.<sup>1</sup>

With respect to the motions to dismiss that have already been filed by defendants, the parties are directed to refile these documents in each of the three new actions to which they relate. The Court does not need additional courtesy copies.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: New York, New York  
May 12, 2014



---

KATHERINE B. FORREST  
United States District Judge

---

<sup>1</sup> As discussed during the April 25, 2014 conference, plaintiffs in the AGFA and Mag Instrument actions are direct purchaser plaintiffs who will “piggyback,” for filing purposes, on the new civil action for the direct purchaser plaintiffs—In re Aluminum Warehousing Antitrust Litigation (Direct Purchaser Plaintiffs) (14 Civ. 3116). (See 4/25/14 Tr. at 8-9.)

Additionally, by separate Order bearing today's date, plaintiffs in 13 Civ. 9095 and 14 Civ. 1855 are to be considered part of the new action for the commercial end user plaintiffs—In re Aluminum Warehousing Antitrust Litigation (Commercial End User Plaintiffs) (14 Civ. 3121).